UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,414	10/12/2000	Howard J. Glaser	STL920000091US1	1232

24852 7590 10/28/2003

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP
IP LAW
555 BAILEY AVENUE , J46/G4
SAN JOSE, CA 95141

EXAMINER	
GROSS, KENNETH A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	7

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/687,414	GLASER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth A Gross	2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 August 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on August 20th, 2003.

2. The double patenting rejection stated in the office action mailed on May 21st, 2003 has been withdrawn in view of the Terminal Disclaimer filed on August 20th, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenner et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,314,565) in view of Stedman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,262,726).

In regard to Claim 1, Kenner teaches: (a) defining and storing a configuration of the application program (Column 7, lines 5-12 and lines 17-32); (b) initiating a connection between the local and remote data processing systems in response to a particular user request (Column 9, lines 39-53); (c) and downloading data from the remote to the local data processing system according to a stored configuration (Column 8, lines 18-29). Kenner does not teach that the configuration of the application program is a user configuration nor does he teach authenticating a particular user in response to a user request for the program. Stedman, however, does teach storing user configurations of an operating system for the purposes of application customization (Column 6, lines 58-62), and further teaches authenticating a particular user when the particular

user attempts to initialize the operating system (Column 6, lines 55-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define and store a configuration of the application program, initiate a connection between the local and remote data processing systems in response to a particular user request, and download data from the remote to the local data processing system according to a stored configuration, as taught by Kenner, where the configuration of the application program is a user configuration, since this allows different users to access different requested software from the same machine.

Claims 7 and 13 correspond directly with Claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1.

In regard to Claim 4, Kenner teaches building the application program according to a configuration (Column 8, lines 30-41).

Claims 10 and 16 correspond directly with Claim 4, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 4.

5. Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenner (U.S. Patent Number 6,314,565) in view of Stedman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,262,726) and further in view of Hsu (U.S. Patent Number 5,894,515).

In regard to Claim 2, Kenner and Stedman teach the article of manufacture of Claim 1, and Kenner further teaches downloading data from the remote to the local data processing system according to a stored configuration (Column 8, lines 18-29), where the configuration is a user configuration, as taught by Stedman (Column 6, lines 58-62). Neither Kenner nor Stedman teach encrypting and storing the configuration in a manifest file nor do either teach decrypting

the configuration in response to user authentication. Hsu, however, does teach encrypting data, authorizing a user, and in response to authorizing a user, decrypting the data (Column 1, lines 13-21). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define and store a client configuration, connect to the client and download data to the client corresponding to the configuration as taught by Kenner, where the user is authenticated before data can be downloaded, as taught by Stedman, and the configuration is encrypted and decrypted in response to user authentication as taught by Hsu, since this protects the configuration for being view from unauthorized users.

Claims 8 and 14 correspond directly with Claim 2, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 2.

In regard to Claim 5, Hsu teaches decrypting data (Column 1, lines 13-21) and Kenner teaches building the application program according to a configuration (Column 8, lines 30-41). Hsu does not explicitly teach authenticating a particular user in response to a request for application build, however, since the information is encrypted, in order to build the application, it must be decrypted by a decryption process on the local computer system. Thus, this decryption acts as an authentication process, since only an authorized user knows the decryption process.

Claims 11 and 17 correspond directly with Claim 5, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 5.

6. Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenner (U.S. Patent Number 6,314,565) in view of Stedman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,262,726) and further in view of Hsu (U.S. Patent Number 5,894,515) and Hayes, Jr. (U.S. Patent Number 6,205,476).

In regard to Claim 3, Kenner, Stedman, and Hsu teach the article of manufacture of Claim 2, and Kenner further teaches: (a) storing the configuration in a manifest file (Column 7, lines 8-12 and lines 17-32); and (b) downloading data from a remote data processing system according to the configuration (Column 8, lines 18-29 and Figure 3), where the configuration is a user configuration, as taught by Stedman (Column 6, lines 58-62). Kenner does not teach encrypting the configuration, authorizing a user in response to a user request for the application program, and decrypting the manifest file to produce a decrypted configuration. Hsu, however, does teach encrypting data, authorizing a user, and in response to authorizing a user, decrypting the data (Column 1, lines 13-21). Neither Kenner nor Hsu teach downloading the manifest file from the remote data processing system to the local data processing system. Hayes, however, does teach storing user-specific application configuration preferences, and transmitting the preferences to the local user system (Column 22, lines 55-59). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define and store a client configuration, connect to the client and download data to the client corresponding to the configuration as taught by Kenner, where the user is authenticated before data can be downloaded, as taught by Stedman, and the configuration is encrypted and decrypted in response to user authentication as taught by Hsu, where the client configuration is stored on the remote processing system and is downloaded to the local processing system, as taught by Hayes, since this allows for a more organized and more central repository of user application preferences.

Claims 9 and 15 correspond directly with Claim 3, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 3.

In regard to Claim 6, Hayes teaches storing application program configurations and user permissions (Column 1, lines 58-63). Hayes further teaches storing user data (Figure 15).

Claims 12 and 18 correspond directly with Claim 6, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 6.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Gross whose telephone number is (703) 305-0542. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

KAG

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER